



THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No. : 10/665,889
5 Filing Date : 19 SEPT 2003
First Named Inventor : DANIEL J. GREGOIRE
Firm Docket No. : HRL025-DIV
10 Art unit : 1763
Examiner : BUEKER, RICHARD R.
15 Office Action Mailing Date : 06 DECEMBER 2006
Response Date : 07 MAY 2007

TITLE: APPARATUS FOR LARGE SCALE DIAMOND POLISHING

20 United States Patent and Trademark Office
ATTN: Richard R. Bueker
BOX RESPONSES
Washington, D.C. 20231

25

Dear Examiner:

This communication is responsive to the Final Office Action dated 06 DECEMBER 2006, having a statutory response period with extensions, extending through and including May 07, 2007. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner enter the
30 following Amendments and consider the Remarks made below to the above captioned application. No new subject matter has been added, and **all amendments and remarks herein are made without prejudice.**

Interview Summary begin on page 2 of this communication.
35 **Listing of Claims** begin on page 3 of this communication.
Remarks/Arguments begin on page 8 of this communication.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

5 Date: April 5, 2007

Time: 1:30 PM (PST)

Parties present: Richard R. Bueker (PTO Examiner), Marcus Risso (patent attorney with Tope-McKay & Associates), and Sylvia Dominguez (patent engineer with Tope-McKay & Associates).

10 Claims discussed: Claim 1, Claim 7, Claim 15, and Claim 16

Subject Matter: The rejection by the Examiner of the use of a “container” in Claims 15 and 16.

A telephonic interview was held with the Examiner on April 5, 2007. During the
15 interview, the Examiner stated that the specification for U.S. Patent Application No. 10/665,889 did not support the use of the word “container,” as claimed in Claims 15 and 16. However, the Examiner agreed that the language in the specification (referring to page 8 lines 18 to 20) supports the use of the phrases: “means for positioning;” a “positioning device;” or a “positioning apparatus.” The Examiner further stated that
20 “using a positioning device is an acceptable meaning of the disclosure,” and that the Examiner will be willing to remove his rejection of Claims 2-6 and 8-16 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, if the Applicants amend the claims to remove the word “container” and replace it with a “positioning device.”

25